

I have sent you clean sheets as far
as p. 352 - Proofs are corrected to p.
400 (in the middle of *Centauria*) & 3
sheets more will finish. The correcting
the proofs and checking the references
is a great labour - I am also printing
Flora Australiensis, vol. VI and a long
paper on *Compositae* read at the
Linnean.

25, WILTON PLACE.

Feb 7 12 S.W.

1843

1843

My dear Gray

Your of the 20th Jan^r reaches me
just as I am sending Addenda et Corrigenda
to the printers. I have inserted the
substitution of *Bizelowia* for *Chryso-*
thamnus. The fact is then *obsteroides*
gives me more trouble than any
other and I have had to go over them
several times twisting and turning
them about without yet arranging
them to my satisfaction. I had at first
characterised *Chrysothamnus* under
Linnaea, but was puzzled with a
Siberian species with a ~~white~~ the rays
(when occasionally present) white and
then studying what Schultze and other
Germans have said about the European
one I felt persuaded they were right

in referring it to a neglected author
(Galatella) so I struck out the Oldworld
group and substituted *Chrysanthemum*
for *Senecio*, leaving the rest as I had
already written it - and overlooked the
priority of DeCandolle's name.

2. Our specimens of *Senecio* *Bigelovii*
A. Sp. have not the cuspidate centre of
the receptacle figured in D. S. Whipple.
We have two good specimens, one from
Berry the other gathered by Bigelow
both sent by you. They are conspecific but
perhaps not conspecific for one has
the achenes twice as long as the others
with the same thickness. In both the
apex of the peduncle bearing the
involute bracts is very long and
when the bracts are off they leave scars
which might be taken for those of the
achenes and the whole looks like a long
or somewhat sub-shaped receptacle -
but (as in *Eupatorium*, *Posidonium*, &c.)
the flowers are only upon the extreme
summit which is scarcely convex but

in this *S. Bigelovii* seems slightly poverlate
with the margin of the poverla slightly
prominent here and there outside the
flowers not in the centre so that
either the receptacle figured in D. S.
Whipple or those I examined must have
been abnormal.

3 *Xanthoxima* I kept up this genus
as much on account of the receptacle as
of the pappus though afterwards in
drawing up the *Compositae* I forgot this
character. I reduced *Acampytopappus*
chiefly because you or Torrey have done
so in *Peckia*, *Egged* and we have no
specimens.

4 *Lepuscia* looks more like the
homochromous than the heterochromous
Asteroid, but seems out of place in
either group - I have not hit upon
any better affinity.

5 *Heruboca*. The only specimens I have
seen of this plant are Bourgeau's, in
which I found no pappus. *Spinebrectis*
is I believe a different plant - I forget
but now what I did with it
Yours very truly, George Donnell